



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		TORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/616,114	07/09/2003	Thomas Hanuschek	•	P2002,0587	2189	
24131	7590 12/12/2006			EXAMINER		
LERNER GREENBERG STEMER LLP				TRUONG, LOAN		
P O BOX 2480 HOLLYWOOD, FL 33022-2480				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
110221 1100	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			2114		
			DA	DATE MAILED: 12/12/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)			
10/616,114	HANUSCHEK ET AL.			
Examiner	.Art Unit			
LOAN TRUONG	2114			

	L	OAN TRUONG		2114	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppear	s on the cover sh	eet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 November 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE	THIS A	APPLICATION IN C	CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to of this application, applicant must timely file one of the f places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp time periods:	or on the following a Notic	ne same day as filir ng replies: (1) an ar se of Appeal (with a	ng a Notice of mendment, aff appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing	date of	f the final rejection.			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of to no event, however, will the statutory period for reply experience in the statutory period for reply experience. If box 1 is checked, check either box (as the statutory period for reply experience).	pire late	er than SIX MONTHS	from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPI		* *			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.70 NOTICE OF APPEAL	of exter the sho later th	nsion and the corresportened statutory peri	onding amount od for reply orig	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS 	extens	ion thereof (37 CF	R 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final reject	ion. bu	it prior to the date of	of filing a brief	. will not be entered b	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE	below));			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in appeal; and/or	n bette	r form for appeal b	y materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling	-	rresponding numb	er of finally rej	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33	(a)).				
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFF	₹ 1.121	. See attached No	tice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	–				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would l _ non-allowable claim(s). 			·	·	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:				Il be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:			•	·	
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
B. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action because applicant failed to provide a showing of goo was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of the entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessarily.	to ove ssary a	ercome <u>all</u> rejectior and was not earlier	ns under appe presented. S	al and/or appellant fai see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ls to provide a 1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explar REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	nation (of the status of the	claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
 The request for reconsideration has been considere <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	ed but o	does NOT place the	e application i	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	t(s). (P	TO/SB/08) Paper I	No(s)		
13. Other:				•	•

Art Unit: 2114

ADVISORY ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 1. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajsuman et al. (US 6,249,893) in further view of Dahn (US 6,320,804).
- 2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajsuman et al. (US 6,249,893) in further view of Dahn (US 6,320,804) in further view of Suzuki et al. (US 2002/0066056).
- 3. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajsuman et al. (US 6,249,893) in further view of Dahn (US 6,320,804) in further view of Saliba (US 5,894,425).

SCOTT BADERMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The amended changes the scope of the claims and therefore would require further consideration and/or search.